



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/706,914	11/14/2003	Tsutomu Okabe	245161US3 CIP	7655
22850	7590	07/19/2006		
C. IRVIN MCCLELLAND OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			EXAMINER MOORE, KARLA A	
			ART UNIT 1763	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 07/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/706,914	OKABE ET AL.	
	Examiner Karla Moore	Art Unit 1763	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Karla Moore. (3) Raymond Cardillo.

(2) Lee Stepina. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 11 July 2006.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-6.

Identification of prior art discussed: Kinpara, otaguro.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: With respect to previously rejected claims 1-4, Applicant's representative reiterated the arguments presented in Applicant's most recent submission, which is yet to be considered by the Examiner. Both the double patenting rejections and the art rejections were discussed. With respect to newly added claims 5 and 6, Applicant's representative briefly discussed what are believed to be further distinguishing features of the claimed invention.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

## Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

### Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

### Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

#### Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

#### 37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the Interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An Indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner.  
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

### Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.



Docket No.: 245161US3CIP

**COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313**

**RE: Application Serial No.: 10/706,914**

Applicants: Tsutomu OKABE, et al.

RCE Filed: December 22, 2005

(Application Filing Date: November 14, 2003)

**For: WAFER PROCESSING APPARATUS HAVING  
DUST PROOF FUNCTION**

Group Art Unit: 1763

Examiner: MOORE, Karla A.

SIR:

Attached hereto for filing are the following papers:

**SUMMARY OF JULY 11, 2006, INTERVIEW SUBMITTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH MPEP  
§ 713.04**

Our check in the amount of \$0.00 is attached covering any required fees. In the event any variance exists between the amount enclosed and the Patent Office charges for filing the above-noted documents, including any fees required under 37 C.F.R 1.136 for any necessary Extension of Time to make the filing of the attached documents timely, please charge or credit the difference to our Deposit Account No. 15-0030. Further, if these papers are not considered timely filed, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for the necessary extension of time. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

**OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.**

Frank C. Olesi  
Frank J. Masi

Gregory J. Maier

Registration No. 25,599

### **Customer Number**

22850

(703) 413-3000 (phone)  
(703) 413-2220 (fax)

**Raymond F. Cardillo, Jr.**

Registration No. 40,440

DOCKET NO: 245161US3CIP



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION OF :  
TSUTOMU OKABE, ET AL. : EXAMINER: MOORE, KARLA A.  
SERIAL NO: 10/706,914 :  
RCE FILED: DECEMBER 22, 2005 : GROUP ART UNIT: 1763  
FOR: WAFER PROCESSING : (APPLICATION FILED: NOVEMBER  
APPARATUS HAVING DUST PROOF 14, 2003)  
FUNCTION

SUMMARY OF JULY 11, 2006, INTERVIEW SUBMITTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH

MPEP § 713.04

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313

SIR:

The following is a Summary of the Interview conducted July 11, 2006, submitted in accordance with MPEP § 713.04:

Regarding the provisional rejection of Claim 1 on the ground of obviousness-type double-patenting over claim 5 of co-pending Application No. 10/706,977 (herein “977”) and claims 1 and 2 of co-pending Application No. 10/330,092 (herein “092”), Applicants traversed the rejection. Applicants argued that Claim 1 of the present application requires the clean box to be “fixed with a first clearance around the entire perimeter” thereof. The first clearance is “between the opening formed plane of the clean box and the outside surface of the part of the wall where the first opening is formed.” On the other hand, claim 5 of ‘977, and claims 1 and 2 of ‘092 includes no such features.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 1 as anticipated by Kinpara, Applicants explained that Claim 1 requires the feature of a “first clearance” between the opening formed plane of the clean box and the outside surface of the part of the wall where the first opening is formed.

Applicants argued that the gap 27 of Kinpara is formed between the outer peripheral surface of the door 35 and the inner peripheral surface of the wall 21, i.e., the inner peripheral surface of the opening 23. Therefore, Kinpara does not disclose a clearance formed between the opening formed plane of the clean box and the outside surface of the part of the wall in which the first opening portion is formed as required by independent Claim 1. Applicants further argued that Otaguro does not correct the deficiencies of Kinpara already discussed.

Respectfully submitted,

**OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.**

Gregory J. Maier  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 25,599

**Raymond F. Cardillo, Jr.  
Registration No. 40,440**

**Customer Number**  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 06/04)  
GJM/RFC/LS:ach

Fax: (703) 475-2220  
(OSMMN 06/04)  
GJM/RFC/LS:dch

14770153243245181153